TRANSCRIPT OF PROJECT PRESENTATION
AND FORUM FOR PUBLIC COMMENTS
RE: LONG BEACH TERMINAL AREA IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

COUNCIL CHAMBERS - LONG BEACH CITY HALL
333 WEST OCEAN BOULEVARD
LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA
DECEMBER 3, 2005
9:28 A.M.

MARY E. PIERCE, CSR 6143
05-265

PRESENTERS:
Christine Eberhard, Facilitator, CommuniQuest
Kathleen Brady, Bonterra Consulting
Jessica Feldman, Jones & Stokes
Cindy Krebs, Bonterra Consulting
Janet Harvey, Meyer, Mohaddes Associates, Inc.
Vince Mestre, Mestre Greve Associates
John Pehrson, CDM

PUBLIC COMMENTS (in order of appearance):
Terry Jensen
Doug Haubert
Mark Bixby
Malcolm Green
James Bell
Phyllis Ortman
Thomas Brown
Jane Nadeau
Kevin McAchren

LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA; SATURDAY, DECEMBER 3, 2005;
9:28 A.M.

MS. EBERHARD: Okay, we have the official go, so we'll get started.

Thank you very much for coming out this morning, and for those of you that have been waiting patiently, a special thank you.

My name is Chris Eberhard with a firm called Communiquest. I'm a subconsultant to Bonterra on this project, and you'll hear from Kathleen in a little bit.

Again, thank you, especially on a Saturday morning, for taking time out of your busy week and this weekend morning. This is the second of what's going to be three public meetings. The next one is Monday, December 5th at the Petroleum Club, which I believe is 3636 Linden. Most of you are probably familiar with where it is.

There are handouts that it looks like most of you have. If you didn't, they're out front, correct? There should be three different ones, one for the power point presentation that you're going to see here in a few minutes, and one is the project description, and then the third one is an abbreviated executive summary.

The draft EIR is available for review on the

City's web site, www.longbeach.gov, at the airport's web site, www.lbg.org, and at each of Long Beach City libraries, the main library in Lakewood, the main library in Signal Hill, and at City of Long Beach Planning and Building Department, fourth floor.

Comments can be submitted via e-mail to Angela Reynolds, Environmental Officer, Planning and Building Department, at this address, 333 West Ocean Boulevard, Long Beach, 90802. They can also be -- you can make e-mail comments, but no attachments. Because of the City's system, it just can't take attachments.

But you can send e-mail comments to airportEIR@longbeach.gov. As you probably are aware, there's a 45-day comment period on this, and that will be ending December 22nd.

I've been asked to remind you that this is not a discussion on the approval of the EIR. This meeting is to take comments on the draft document, the draft EIR. This is your opportunity to comment on the document, and it won't really be a question-and-answer session.

The CEQA process requires that the City respond to all comments in writing as part of the final EIR that will be submitted to the Planning Commission after the conclusion of the public comment period. And therefore, we won't be orally responding to comments made today.

The timing for the meeting will be four hours. Or three hours. I'm sorry. And the presentation is going to take about an hour. And then any of you that are interested in making comments, we can do it at that time.

As you know, there's restrooms out over to the right, and feel free to kind of get up and move around if you need to, but I would caution you that we do have a court reporter here today.

Mary was with us the other evening and is here again today, and if you have side conversations, it would be helpful if you went out in the hall so that there isn't disruption because she has to hear carefully.

With that, I will begin the presentation. I'll introduce Kathleen Brady, the project manager from Bonterra, and she'll get us started.

MS. BRADY: Thank you, Chris.

One thing I'd like to comment on is for the people on the side, sometimes it's harder to see the power point slides because there's some distortion. So if you're having a hard time focusing, it seems to be clearer in the middle. I'll just leave it at that.

As Chris indicated, I'm Kathleen Brady, and I'm with Bonterra Consulting, and our firm has prepared the Environmental Impact Report consistent with the Environmental Quality Act. Also with me are some of the

experts who prepared the technical studies on which the findings of the EIR are based.

Jessica Feldman is the architectural historian with Jones & Stokes. They prepared the cultural analysis. Cindy Krebs is also with Bonterra Consulting and prepared the hazardous materials and public services analysis and will also be discussing aesthetics today.

Vince Mestre, with Mestre, Greve & Associates, conducted the noise analysis. Janet Harvey with Meyer, Mohaddes Associates, prepared the traffic analysis, and John Pehrson, with CDM, was responsible for the air quality and human health risk assessment.

The EIR was prepared with the basic premise that the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance would not be modified. The key objective is to provide airport facilities to accommodate the maximum -- excuse me -- the minimum number of flights at the airport, which per the ordinance is 41 commercial flights and 25 commuter flights and the associated number of passengers served on those flights and have it in full compliance with all applicable fire, building and safety codes, as well as other applicable standards.

Associated with that objective is the commitment to compliance with the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance and maintaining the current

character of the airport terminal building as a Long Beach cultural heritage landmark.

The proposed improvements would be implemented in the area surrounding the airport terminal, the airport parking area, aircraft ramp and Parcel O, which is located at Clark and Willow Streets.

This exhibit, by the way, is in the handout of the summary document, because I know it's pretty hard to see. But to give you some bearings, here's Lakewood Boulevard, here's the terminal building area, the existing parking structure, and the improvements would be in this area through here.

The area that's shown with the hash marks I'll be discussing later. It's an area that is currently leased to Million Air and would be used for some of the parking, aircraft parking improvements.

The proposed parking structure is there, and associated with that -- and I'll be discussing this more -- is the extension.

Currently, the Douglas Drive Loop ramp comes through here. Because of the parking structure, it would extend out to Lakewood and have a right-out only.

I'm never going to get this striaght. I'm just going to pass it to you.

As previously indicated, a basic premise of the

project was maintaining the tenets of the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance, and the ordinance allows a minimum of 41 commercial carrier flights and 25 commuter flights.

These facilities proposed as part of the project have been sized to accommodate the passenger levels associated with the minimum number of flights.

The Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance also allows the number of flights to increase over the minimum 41 flights provided the noise budget outlined in the ordinance is not exceeded.

In order for the number of flights to be increased and still comply with the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance, the airlines would have to optimize their flight operations through methods such as using quieter aircraft and reducing the number of late-night operations.

Under optimal conditions, which have never been achieved at the airport, the estimated number of increased flights would range between seven and eleven flights. Though the proposed project, which is the terminal area improvements, would not either directly or indirectly allow the increased number of flights, at the direction of the City Council, the EIR evaluated the impacts associated with the maximum number of flights that could be expected.

In the EIR analysis, this was identified as the optimized flight scenario because in order to be achieved, the flight level, the airlines would have to optimize their operations, and the optimized flight scenario assumed 52 daily commercial flights and 25 daily flights.

The proposed improvements are in 13 primary areas, which are listed up here, and I will get into these in just a few moments. The City Council established the size of these improvements in February 2005.

Also as part of our evaluation, a basic concept plan was provided to the consultant team so that we would have some of our basic parameters for evaluation in the EIR, and it is premature to develop a final design of the airport until the improvements are approved by the City Council and an alternative selection is selected.

But during the final design, as well as the concept plan, the design -- excuse me -- the precise size and configuration would be ensured through compliance with the applicable fire codes and safety and security requirements, that the overall size of the airport terminal improvements would not exceed the square footage allocations and would be consistent with the parameters ultimately adopted by the City Council.

In developing the concept plan, as well as the ultimate design of the facility, there were basic guiding

principles that were used to ensure that the building would be consistent with the historic nature of the airport terminal building.

These include the 1990 MOU, which was adopted by the Cultural Heritage Commission and the City Council pertaining to modifications of the terminal building. This MOU, Memorandum of Understanding, includes the Secretary of Interior standards for rehabilitation of historic buildings.

There's also the development and use standards for the Long Beach Airport terminal plan development ordinance, which is the zoning code, and also a 2005 memorandum which provided guidance on any new construction at the airport.

In addition, the City has committed to designing and constructing the new facilities to meet the high standards for energy efficiency and environmental design, and the intent is to construct the facilities consistent with LEED standards, which stands for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design.

As I said, the improvements are in 13 basic areas, and this shows the terminal area. It does not show the parking structure. But to give you a feel here, here is the existing terminal building, and here is the Donald Douglas Loop Road in front of the terminal.

The gray color are areas that are proposed to be enclosed as part of buildings. Kind of light green area would be open kiosks where they'd be covered, but -- they would be open sides but have a cover. And then the darker green are proposed as garden areas.

The first area identified was the holdrooms, which is proposed back here. And this exhibit also, by the way, is in the summary document handout if you want to follow along with that.

Currently, the airport holdrooms are comprised of all the 1984 permanent holdrooms and the temporary modular buildings. As part of the proposed project, the 13,150 square feet of temporary holdroom currently being provided through the use of modular buildings would be replaced with 21,101 square feet of permanent floor space. This is a net increase of 8,021 square feet.

The second area was concessions, which the concept plan shows as being in this location, and these would serve the new holdrooms area. Currently, there are 5,460 square feet of concession at the airport, and the proposed project would add an additional 9,541 square feet.

The passenger security screening would be done in this location. You basically come in and go through the terminal building, which is actually how the original

design of the terminal was, that it was open in the back to the airfield area. And the security, passenger security screening, would be in that location.

This would be designed to meet the requirements of the Transportation Security Administration, also known as TSA. And currently, there are 3,900 square feet of passenger screening, and with the proposed project, there would be an additional 7,000 square feet devoted to this use.

With the baggage security screening in this location, this is -- currently, the airport does not provide a structure for conducting baggage screening, and since 2003, this has been done under a canopy, and TSA has indicated that this open-air situation is not sufficient because of the sensitivity of the equipment being used. And the proposed project would provide for a 7,000 square foot structure for security screening of baggage.

The baggage would then go to an adjacent open-air area called the baggage makeup area, which would just be covered.

The baggage claim devices would be over in this area. And currently, the airport has 226 linear feet of passenger-side baggage claim devices, and with the proposed project, the area would provide a total of 510 linear square feet. And this is an area that would be

open air similar to how it is now, whether it be covered with a roof or a canopy.

The sixth area is the baggage service office and multipurpose rooms. These are shown down here in the corner, this little area through here.

And the airport does not have a baggage service office or any sufficient meeting room space, and the proposed project would allocate 900 square feet for a baggage service office and 300 square feet for a multipurpose room.

This area would provide for holding of unclaimed bags, bags that were misdirected or for reporting lost luggage. The multipurpose room would provide an on-site meeting space for shift briefings, training and other meetings for airport and tenant staff whose job duties do not allow them to leave the terminal area.

Restrooms would be provided over in here, and there would be a 2,000 square foot increase in restrooms in the non-security areas for a total of 3330 square feet of restrooms.

The eighth area of improvements is office space, which would be designed to meet the TSA, the airlines and airport administration needs. TSA would have an area through here. As I said, final design, the

precise locations and such may change some, but this is the basic concept.

The airlines offices -- I'm not sure if I mentioned that. The TSA would have 5,191 square feet of permanent space. Currently, they're in a modular building, temporary modular building.

The airline offices are currently housed in approximately 2,000 square feet, and an additional 3,754 square feet would be allocated for this use. That's over in here. The airport offices and conference areas would increase from 6,970 square feet to 11,970 square feet, maybe off in there.

The ticketing facilities at the airport would also be expanded. The ticketing facilities can be broken into four categories, ticketing counter area, ticketing counter queuing area, airline ticket office, and circulation for the ticketing.

And the combined space for ticketing operations, all four categories, at the airport would increase from 6,423 square feet from the current 8,410 up to 14,000 square feet, and this would be in this location here.

The airline gates. Currently, the airport has eight aircraft gates for boarding and loading and unloading of aircraft, and with the proposed project, this

would increase to 11 gates. The term "gates" at Long Beach Airport is used to identify the doors and the holdrooms that are used for passenger boarding. You can see the little lines through here. So these would be the gates.

There would be no possibility for jetways at the airport. Jetways are where you provide direct access from the airport terminal to the aircraft itself, and in order for jetways to be constructed, there needs to be a second story, and the proposed improvements are one story and could not be retrofitted to accommodate a second story because of their design.

The aircraft parking positions. Currently, the airport has ten aircraft parking positions, and this would be increased to as many as 14, and they're shown in this location.

And as I indicated earlier when I pointed out on that other exhibit the thatched markings where there's land that's currently leased to Million Air for general aviation tie-down and delay parking, that general aviation aircraft would be displaced, and they would be relocated to a new tie-down area on Parcel O, which would be located south of runway 12-30, the long runway down by Clark and Willow Street. And this use down on Parcel O is consistent with the March 2003 Long Beach airport

development area's map.

There's also the potential that aircraft hangars for small general aviation aircraft could be provided on Parcel O.

Vehicular parking is the twelfth area of improvements. As I said, it does not show on this exhibit, but I did point it out on the other aerial photograph.

Currently, vehicular parking at the airport is available through surface lots in the parking structure and from off-site parking lots leased from the airport from Boeing, which is known as lot D.

There are currently 2,835 permanent parking spaces at the airport and approximately 2100 leased spaces, and the leased spaces are on a month-to-month basis, and the proposed project would construct a new parking structure, which would combine the existing parking structure and the surface parking to provide a total of 6,286 spaces on site. This would eliminate the need for the off-site parking, and the project would have a net increase of 1,351 parking spaces from what's currently available at the airport.

And as I mentioned earlier, because of the parking structure's location, it would require the relocation of the east side of Donald Douglas Loop Drive.

Also associated with the modifications to the parking would be modifications to the existing parking structure, which would include a new facade to match the parking structure and compliment the architecture of the terminal building. And this would provide a unified appearance and enhancement of the aesthetics at the airport with -- and the identification of the airport terminal building as a cultural heritage landmark.

And the final area of improvements is, as I mentioned, the loop road for Donald Douglas, extending that out, as well as other modifications for signage and lighting for vehicular and pedestrian traffic through the parking structures and lots.

As far as how it would look, the City has adopted the guiding principles, which I mentioned earlier, for ensuring that the modifications would reflect the historic airport terminal or enhance that, and the City highly values the terminal building and wants to ensure its historic integrity.

To accomplish this, the design ensured that the improvements would not look like add-ons to the terminal building or a wall of structures as you approach, and the modifications to the interior of the building were to be in keeping with the original design.

This visual here is also in the package, and it

shows the terminal, the existing terminal building here and what it would look like from above on the airside view. So the holdroom, then the side structures, the terminal building.

As far as the alternatives that were looked at in the EIR, there were three primary alternatives that were evaluated. Alternative A was based on the improvements proposed in the 2003 NOP with minor modifications, and Alternative A assumed the airport terminal area would be a maximum of 97,545 square feet compared to the 102,000 -- slightly over 102,000 with the proposed project.

The nature of the improvements would generally be the same as the proposed project with minor reduction in square footage in all areas except for the baggage security screening would be the same as the proposed project. There was no additional space assumed for ticketing facilities, and the amount of airport office space is actually increased compared to the proposed project.

The 2003 NOP assumed 16 aircraft parking spaces. However, the City Council determined in February of 2005 that no more than 14 aircraft parking spaces would be evaluated in the EIR. So that is a slight modification to what was circulated in 2003.

Alternative B would further reduce the size of the airport terminal improvements and would provide a maximum of 79,725 square feet. As with the other alternative, the nature of the improvements would be generally the same. It would not result in any reduction in the square footage for the baggage screening, there would be no additional space assumed for ticketing, and there was no additional space assumed for airport office space.

And Alternative C is the no-project alternative, and this is required by CEQA, and it assumes that no new facilities would be provided at the airport. And the vehicular parking or spaces that are currently leased were assumed not to be available because of the short-term nature of the leases, and based on recent discussions with Boeing, they have indicated that the leases would not be available on a long-term basis.

So as a result, the no-project alternative would have a net loss of 2100 parking spaces compared to current conditions.

As far as the phasing of the project, the proposed project would be based on availability of funding and service priorities, but the design is expected to begin following the project approval by the City Council and, pending funding, it is anticipated that be

constructed to -- in phases to minimize impacts to the operations at the airport and as outlined here.

And if this -- all these slides are in the handouts, so you can read it easier, that the phasing would be expected to be the same for all the alternatives, with the first level of improvements would be the construction of Parcel O, then the parking structure improvements, and then the terminal improvements initiating approximately March of 2007 and expected to take 24 months to complete.

The EIR did identify impacts for the -- associated with the project. They were aesthetics, construction air quality, cultural resources and hazards. And with the mitigation program, which is in the handout of the summary document, all but construction air quality impacts would be reduced to less than significant. These impacts will be discussed in more detail in a little bit.

And as I indicated earlier, the EIR also addressed the optimized flights scenario, the 52 commercial flights and 25 commuter flights. With the optimized flight scenario, there were also impacts for air quality, land use and transportation and circulation, and after implementation, mitigation measures, only air quality impacts would remain signifcant, unavoidable impacts.

There are also benefits associated with the proposed project. The project would provide for enhanced TSA and airport security by providing better facilities. It would improve existing and future traffic conditions by providing enhanced parking on site.

The project also has a component in it to provide the infrastructure necessary to support electric ground support equipment, or GSE, which is a heavy pollutant, polluting component of the project. So it would improve air quality.

And though not associated with the project, the EIR, the EIR did not identify a noise impact because we're keeping to the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance, but the EIR does recommend development of a land use compatibility program with the optimized flights to benefit homes in the 65 CNEL contour and schools within the 60 contour, and this would be a voluntary noise attenuation program.

CEQA also does require the identification of an environmentally superior alternative. This is done by comparing the impacts associated with the various alternatives that are evaluated, as well as the ability of the alternatives to meet the project objectives.

And while the no-project alternative would avoid construction-related impacts, it would have more

substantial long term traffic impacts, associated air quality impacts because there would not be sufficient parking, which would result in additional trips associated with meeters and and greeters, which Janet will discuss in more detail later.

And also, the no-project would not include the mitigation measures that are associated with the human health risk assessment, would be providing the infrastructure for the GSE.

So given that there was also not very substantial -- the impacts associated with the various alternatives were not substantially different because they are providing very similar type of improvements, the footprint would not be that substantially different because there's not a large range in the type of improvements and the sizing, that each alternative would provide additional capacity to help serve the number of passengers, and they would all still meet the minimum number of flights provided for in the Airport Noise Compatibility program.

The project alternative was viewed as the environmentally superior alternative because it would better be able to meet needs of the project objectives by providing the required facilities to serve the flights and their associated passengers.

HNTB had conducted a study in 2004 during the scoping process to make recommended sizes of the facilities to best meet the needs, and all of the HNTB recommendations exceed even the square footage of the proposed project.

And so it was felt that since the proposed project would be able to meet all the objectives and would better be able to meet the needs, that it was identified as the environmentally superior alternative.

As far as if the project would -- what we're looking at right now is the certification of the EIR by the Planning Commission, and that is only a determination of if the EIR addresses the impacts associated with the proposed project. It does not approve the project itself.

That's a separate action taken by the City Council, and in addition to that, the actual design would have to be reviewed by the Cultural Heritage Commission, and a certificate of appropriateness would have to be issued prior to any sort of construction.

With that, I'll turn it over to Jessica, who will talk about the historical nature.

MS. FELDMAN: Thank you, Kathleen.

First, I'd like to present a little bit of background information on the airport terminal building historical significance before discussing impacts from the

proposed improvements.

As many of you may already know, the airport terminal building, built in 1941, was designated in 1990 as a City of Long Beach Cultural Heritage Landmark. A few reasons for the designation were it was or is the first municipal airport in the Southern California region; it exemplifies the historical and economic heritage of the community; it is considered a masterpiece of an early American style, modern style, Streamline Moderne, and is unique to the City; the use of the ceramic mosaic tile throughout the building was considered innovative at the time, and the use of representational images reflected the artistic trends of the era; it is the quintessential theme building of the airport and its signature element; and it is the most prominent visual feature of the airport, which represents an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood.

In order to determine if proposed improvements would constitute changes in the significance of the historical resource, it's necessary to identify character-defining features of the building.

Character-defining features are those architecturally significant interior and exterior elements that best convey the original use of the building. Some of the character-defining features of the airport terminal

building, which were identified from site visits, historical research and photographs, include but are not limited to the architectural style and the related elements, such as the round windows and vents, the geometric panels in the rear elevation, the curved walls, smooth surfaces, the building's footprint, which is shaped as a segment of an arc, the stepped-back stories, second and third stories. The original windows and doors were carefully designed in relationship to the building and surrounding mosaic tiles.

After reviewing the design concept plans, it was determined that the building will retain its overall historic character. The proposed new construction will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible in size, massing, scale and style, and most importantly, it will continue to be used as an airport terminal.

However, several components of the proposed improvements would materially destroy or alter some character-defining features, which under CEQA is considered a significant impact.

The project components which do not meet the Secretary of the Interior standards for rehabilitation of historic buildings include where the new building would connect to the original, where new doors and windows would be introduced, changes to spatial relationships, and

removal or obscuring of original details.

However, we feel the proposed mitigation measures and changes in design would reduce these impacts to a level less than significant.

And now I'm going to turn it over to Cindy, who will discuss the aesthetics, hazards, hazardous waste and public services section.

MS. KREBS: Thank you.

First I want to speak about aesthetics, which is the CEQA EIR word for how things look.

The City zoning ordinance and the May 1990 MOU both set forth guidelines for improvements to the airport terminal building. Those guidelines talk about building siting and stipulate that space should be incorporated between buildings to avoid a wall-like appearance.

They also discuss building heights, and the focus there is that there is compliance with FAA height restrictions and also that the new buildings would integrate well with the existing buildings.

Parking structures are also covered, and the design theme for that would include rooftop landscape planters and also an observance of height restrictions.

And then as far as overall design is concerned, the guidelines say that the unique architectural features should be preserved and be consistent with, as well as in

harmony with, the existing terminal building.

During construction, the proposed project would temporarily alter views of the project site. The types of things that would occur during construction, there would be staging of construction equipment. Materials would be brought on site and stored, such as soil that may be stored in stockpiles, surfaces would be graded, and truck traffic would occur. Those impacts would only be temporary and would only occur during construction.

Also during construction, there could be potential light and glare impacts. Those would be associated with security lighting, as well as light emanating from the proposed improvements.

The mitigation program that's proposed would reduce those impacts to a level considered less than significant by recommending and implementing the following types of features: Low intensity lighting, orientation or shielding away from streets and residences. That is the light would be shielded so that it doesn't create glare towards streets or residences. And then the glass that would be used in the building would be less than 20 percent reflective.

The proposed project would be compatible with the existing terminal building in size, massing, scale and style. With respect to the size and massing, when you

look at the way that the existing buildings are laid out on the terminal or at the airport with all the holdrooms and everything that's kind of ancillary to the terminal building itself, there is quite a spread and quite a footprint that already exists there.

The proposed design of the new building wouldn't expand much beyond where all the temporary buildings and everything are on site right now.

With respect to scale, the new buildings would be lower in elevation than the existing terminal building so that views from the back, such as the restaurant and deck, all of that would still be available.

And with respect to style, the new construction would incorporate some stylistic elements of the Streamline Moderne architectural theme. It would incorporate curved roofs. The west wall of the holdrooms would be mostly windows. The arc shape, which is a characteristic feature of the terminal building, as Jessica mentioned, would be copied in the roof shape of the small attached building, and the elevation of the new roof would be higher as it moves from there toward the front of the building. All of those will be Streamline Moderne, stepped elevation.

In the picture that's here and in your packet shows an aerial view from the land side of the airport.

Did want to mention this view isn't available to hardly anybody because of the flat topography of the area around the airport and all the existing buildings. There would be just a few people who would have any view that would be anything -- that would show anything as extensive as this.

With respect to hazardous waste, the analysis approach that we used followed CEQA guidelines, and CEQA guidelines say that the EIR should concern itself with impacts that could result from implementation of the proposed project.

Therefore, the analysis that we conducted focused on the areas where the project would have impacts, the terminal areas, the parking areas, and lot O. We did not look at the entire airport, the airfield going all the way up to the 405. We focused on areas where there would be impacts.

However, having said that, we did gather data from a wide variety of sources and for areas that extend beyond the proposed project limit. We looked at existing and historic records regarding the use of hazards and hazardous waste materials at the airport. Those are documented in the June 2005 EDR report.

We also looked at state and federal databases regarding known discharges, investigation and remediation activities at the airport, and we gathered information

from airport staff, FBO -- those are fix-based operators -- representatives, the Long Beach Fire Department, the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Air Bureau, and all of them provided information about their current and past hazardous material use and containment practices at the airport.

Among the types of information they provided us were past spill and cleanup efforts. We also know and have documented where there are underground and above-ground storage tanks.

We also looked at a 1998 asbestos survey and found that there is asbestos, as you would expect in a building that was constructed in 1941.

We also in some of these areas used common sense. We also know because of the age of the building, there's likely lead-based paint. We also know because of the location of the airport, that immediately adjacent to the 405 freeway, that there's probably aerially deposited lead.

The current hazardous waste programs and practices at the airport are all very, very good. We learned that all the incidences that have occurred have been addressed appropriately and that all cases have been closed.

The airport and the City share an ongoing

commitment to the proper handling of hazardous materials at the airport, and they have documentation of those in a couple of key documents. One, the Long Beach Airport Certification Manual, and another, the Long Beach Airport Rules and Regulations.

Not only does airport staff have to follow those, but everybody else who uses the airport has to follow those practices.

The airport also has a storm water pollution prevention plan. The City's industrial national pollutant discharge elimination system, NPDES, permit comes into place, and the City, through their guidelines, through their programs, ensures that the BMP, best management practices, are being followed.

All of these programs have been approved by the FAA, the Federal Aviation Administration, and they document procedures for addressing fuel handling, inspections, fueler training, corrective action and hazardous material cleanup.

In addition, they comply with all local and State construction building requirements and regulations, including the Uniform Building Code.

As I mentioned briefly, we know from the 1998 asbestos survey that the terminal building does contain asbestos, and we assume that it may also contain

lead-based paint. That would be investigated before construction begins.

We also believe that Parcel O could, although testing hasn't happened -- and it would precede any activity -- but could contain aerially deposited lead and perhaps even trace amounts of DDT. When there was an airfield project at the airport a couple of years ago, trace amounts of DDT, well below significant thresholds, were found because the grassy areas used to be treated with a fertilizer that contained DDT.

During construction, these hazardous materials could be released into the atmosphere in the vicinity of the airport, but through a combination of existing rules and procedures, as well as the mitigation program that's recommended, those would be contained, and there would be assurance that hazardous materials impacts would be reduced to a level less than significant.

All of the contractors who would be working on this project would be required to obtain all required permits, and those permits would ensure that they properly handle and remove all materials that are considered hazardous, that appropriate testing takes place and that regional regulations from the South Coast Air Quality Management District, the State Water Resources Control Board and all other applicable procedures and regulations

are followed.

My final topic is public services. The EIR discusses fire and police protection services, as well as TSA and airport security activities at the airport. It also makes note of the fact that TSA is requesting improvements to enhance the safety at the airport, safety and security.

Kathleen talked about the fact that one of the things that they are continuously concerned about and that they made a request for improvements has to do with the handling of baggage security screening.

The equipment they use is very sensitive, and the wind that occurs in the open air situation that they have right now compromises their ability to perform that task as well as they'd like to.

The proposed project would provide more secure baggage and passenger security screening areas. It would also reduce possible safety hazards that could result from overcrowding.

If any of you have ever been at the airport, used the airport during a peak time, it's not uncommon for crowds to occur outside the terminal, and then as you move into the ticketing area, into the gate and holdrooms, because of the spaces are so small, it becomes pretty tight in there right now.

Significant impacts could occur without the proposed project under the optimized flight scenario. Again, the optimized flight scenario is what's allowed by the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance, the 41 plus 25 flights plus 11. Under those conditions, we think that security and circulation, safety, could be more significant concerns at the airport. More passengers, more baggage, just could lead to more crowded conditions.

The staffing levels at the airport for airport security, as well as police and fire protection, would be adjusted as necessary to meet changing demands. Those are all City staff positions, and the City budget provides the flexibility to increase numbers as necessary to meet demands at the airport.

With that, I am going to ask Vince to speak with you about noise.

MR. MESTRE: Thank you.

This is a very brief summary of the noise analysis that is contained in the EIR. EIR section 3.6 is the noise analysis, and it contains much more information than I can squeeze into this presentation.

The very detailed technical studies are contained in appendix F of the EIR. The noise analysis can be summarized in two figures. The first is Exhibit 3.6 dash 9 from the EIR. It shows the existing noise

contours for calendar year 2004.

There are 15 homes within the 65 CNEL noise contour, which is the noise land use standard used by the State of California and the City of Long Beach. There are no schools within the existing 60 CNEL contours.

On this map, the outer contour is the 60, the yellow is the 65, and the 15 homes are located right here. The 70 CNEL contour is essentially on airport property, and it's the purplish color that's on this slide.

These slides are in your packet. They are in a different color. I've used a brighter color here so you could see them in the brighter room.

This is a close-up showing the homes within the 65 CNEL contour north and south of the airport. Most of the homes are located right here north of the airport for existing conditions, and there are a couple of homes down here that just are touching the 65 CNEL contour south of the airport.

We looked at future conditions with this project and identified that this project will not affect future conditions. The Long Beach Airport noise ordinance establishes a noise budget for airlines and cargo operators. That budget permits at least 41 air carrier departures a day -- that includes cargo departures -- and 25 commuter aircraft departures per day.

In 2004, 41 air carrier departures were allocated, and on weekdays, that level was reached. The 25 commuter flights are not being used.

The noise budget permits more flights if the airlines operate below the noise budget. How many more flights that could be realized if the airlines and cargo operators use the quietest aircraft available to them and they reduce the number of nighttime violations is an issue that is addressed in the EIR.

That analysis showed that under ideal but realistic assumptions, as many as 11 additional commercial flights could be accommodated. Of course, these additional flights would have to be of the quietest aircraft types and not during the night hours.

That slide should have been up during that whole speech. Sorry about that.

These are the noise contours for the potential optimized flight conditions in the future. The potential future case that was analyzed in the EIR is the case where the 11 additional flights are realized and the 25 commuter flights occur. These noise contours are shown as Exhibit 3.6 dash 14 in the EIR.

Most importantly, achieving the budget potential of 11 additional commercial flights and 25 commuter flights is not dependent on this project. Can

these additional flights occur without this project? And the answer is yes.

For the case of the future potential contours with 11 additional commercial flights and 25 commuter flights, there are 11 homes in the 65 CNEL contour. There are two schools that fall within the 60 CNEL contour. This is the Minnie Gant Elementary School and a special education building at the School Safety and Emergency Preparedness offices.

Here's a close-up of the potential optimized flight contours. North of the airport, the contours actually get slightly smaller and there are no homes. The 11 homes that are impacted are all south of the airport as the contour grows a little bit to the south of the optimized future flight condition.

This is the location of the 60 CNEL contour shown here in green, and it falls on the Minnie Gant Elementary School. This is the 60 CNEL contour and special education building that's located in the school emergency preparedness offices, and this is the Los Coyotes Diagonal. This is the 65 CNEL contour. This is the 60 just touching the special ed building.

Even though the potential future noise contours can be achieved with or without this project, the mitigation measure has been identified. That's mitigation

measure 3.6 dash 2.

Within 24 months of certification of the EIR, the airport shall develop a sound insulation program for homes within the 65 CNEL contour and schools within the 60 CNEL contour. Sound insulation treatment will generally include sound rated windows and doors and other modifications to ensure that the interior noise environment meets State and local noise limits.

Construction noise analyses are also included in the EIR. Any night construction on Parcel O will require noise monitoring, and if the City noise limits are exceeded, construction will have to stop until the construction mitigation plan is implemented.

Janet Harvey will now discuss traffic impacts.

MS. HARVEY: Thank you.

For the traffic study, the terminal improvement project in and of itself, a larger building would not cause an increase in traffic. Additional trips would result from the optimized flight scenario due to the additional passengers. Therefore, the traffic study performed an analysis of the optimized flight scenario.

The study intersections that we looked at are on this map here, and you can see they go from Carson on the north, Willow to the west -- I guess Willow to the south, Cherry to the west, and Clark on the east side.

Assumptions that were made for the traffic study again were the optimized flights were in place, which is your 52 commercial and 25 commuter flights. We considered the new exit that would go onto southbound Lakewood Boulevard in the with-project conditions, and the parking demand was based on 2.75 spaces per 1,000 annual departing passengers, and this was based on an earlier study that was completed for the City.

The number of vehicle trips that would occur under the optimized flight conditions was based on existing passenger data, and we also compared this data to the John Wayne and Ontario airport studies that were recently completed, and the number of vehicle trips is very comparable, you know, per passenger to these other airports.

The traffic study looked at two different time periods. The first one was existing, like today's conditions, with the project and with optimized flights, which basically means we wake up tomorrow, the additional flights and the new building is there. And then we also looked at 2020 conditions with the optimized flights, and when compared with project and the no-project, 2020 conditions also assumed that Douglas Park is in place and open and mitigations for Douglas Park are in place.

For the existing with the project with

optimized flights, we also assume that the off-site parking at lot D, parking in the Boeing lot, is still available for use since it's supposed to be like what would happen tomorrow.

But the study found two impacted intersections, and these would be at Lakewood and Spring and Lakewood at Willow, and mitigation measures were recommended as the passenger numbers increase and, therefore, the traffic would increase.

We also looked at the 2020 conditions with optimized flights, and we assumed that no off-site parking was available on the Boeing lot. And when the City originally looked at parking for this project, they based it on the Noise Compatibility Ordinance number of flights of 41 plus 25 commercial and commuter flights.

But since we're analyzing the optimized flight scenario, which is the 52 commercial flights, there would be a parking deficiency, but the proposed project supplies more parking with the new parking structure.

So just to kind of summarize it, in the no-project conditions, there's less parking, and when you have less parking, there's more drop-off trips, and that's like when someone takes you to the airport, drops you off, comes back to the airport to pick you up when you arrive back.

So there's two trips. The number of trips doubles on a drop-off trip instead of you just going and parking and leaving. In the with-project conditions, there's more parking, and therefore, there's less drop-off trips.

So the 2020 traffic study results show that the proposed project with its additional parking generates fewer trips than the no project because more people will be able to drive and park at the airport and less people will have to be dropped off, remembering that drop-off trips generate twice as many trips, in and out both ways, than a single person, a person just driving to the airport and parking.

So, therefore, the optimized flight scenario does result in added trips, but the project itself does not result in significant traffic impacts.

And now we're going to have John talk about air quality analysis and then health risk assessment.

MR. PEHRSON: Good morning, and we're almost done.

Air quality impact analysis and human health risk assessment began with the development of the protocol. This protocol was submitted and reviewed through the California Air Resources Board and the South Coast Air Quality Management District.

The protocol describes the models and methods

that are used in the analysis and defines the CEQA significance thresholds that the project impacts are compared to, and it defines the human health risk assessment exposure parameters used in the calculations.

Both the ARB and South Coast AQMD provided comments on our protocol. Their comments were incorporated. We resubmitted a revised protocol for their review. The AQMD had some final comments, and those comments were incorporated in the final protocol.

The protocol can be found as an attachment to Appendix C of the draft EIR. Appendix C provides the details of the air quality impact analysis and human health risk assessment conducted on the project. These results are summarized in section three of the main document.

These are the criteria pollutants that are analyzed in the air quality impact analysis: Carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, ozone precursors, or NOx, and volatile organic compounds, and particulate matter was analyzed as both PM10 and PM2.5. Sulfur dioxide was included, as was lead, which is not shown on this slide, but was a panel item as both a criteria pollutant and a toxic air contaminant, which is shown on the right side of this screen about halfway down.

The other pollutants analyzed in the health

risk assessment are diesel particulate matter and the toxic VOC and semi-VOC organic compounds listed on the left side of the screen. pH's included seven of the most toxic pH compounds commonly found from exhaust emissions.

In addition, the human health risk exposure parameters looked at several receptors and exposure duration. Adult residents were assumed to live in the area for 70 years and be exposed to impacts for 350 days per year, and these receptors were assumed to be located at both residence and at school sites.

Workers were assumed to be exposed for 40 years, 245 days per year, and were located at commercial and industrial sites both on and off the airport. These two receptors are required for South Coast AQMD health risk assessment calculations.

In addition, we looked at a number of other receptors for CEQA exposure. These included a child resident and a school child, as well as workers located at schools. Potential cancer risk and non-cancer risk, such as impacts to respiratory and nervous systems, were analyzed. However, none of the project impacts or optimized flight impacts for any of the receptors analyzed exceeded the significance thresholds defined in the protocol.

We did have several impacts for ambient air

quality. The Clean Air Act addresses air quality by using two approaches to define ambient air quality standards for pollutant concentrations in community locations, and it also allows for the development of emission limits for specific source types.

The CEQA significance thresholds have been developed in both concentrations and emissions. For this analysis, construction-related emissions from the proposed project would result in short-term exceedances of the threshold of significance for NOx and VOC.

A number of mitigation measures were developed for construction and included emulsified diesel fuel and/or particulate traps that would reduce construction impacts. With the inclusion of the mitigation measures, however, NOx and VOC emissions still remained above the significance threshold.

Although not part of the project, impacts were associated with the optimized flight scenario. Significant impacts were found for both emissions and concentrations under this scenario.

Increased flight activity under the optimized flight scenario would result in an exceedance of the PM10 concentrations due primarily to diesel-powered ground support equipment and fugitive road dust or re-entrained road dust.

Recommended mitigations, such as electric connections and preconditioned air at gates, as well as the electrified ground support equipment, would reduce these impacts but not below the level of significance defined in the protocol.

Finally, emissions of CO and NOx would also exceed the threshold of significance under the optimized flight scenario. These emissions are due primarily to aircraft, auxiliary power units and ground support equipment.

Recommended mitigation measures would reduce the impacts of CO below a level of significance. However, the NOx would remain above the significant threshold.

With that, I'll return the presentation back to Kathleen.

MS. BRADY: Thank you.

As Chris indicated earlier, the public review period ends December 22nd, and per CEQA requirements, all comments that we receive on the EIR, any of the three public meetings, including today's, any written comments, e-mail comments, will all be responded to in writing, and that way the entire package with all the responses is provided to the Planning Commission when they consider the accuracy of the EIR.

The slide here provides the address where

comments can be sent. This is also in your handouts, and there's comment cards in the back. The address is also on the comment cards in the back.

The e-mail address is provided where if you prefer to send comments, you can e-mail the comments in. As Chris also indicated, if you have attachments, it's a good idea to go ahead and send them, as well, because of the virus screening, they don't always get in.

So with that, I'll turn it over to Chris, and we'll begin to take comments for today. Thank you.

MS. EBERHARD: Thank you, Kathleen, and thank you, your team, for the presentation.

I need to go over a couple details also for those of you that may have joined us late. This is the second of three meetings, so the next meeting is going to be from 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. on Monday evening at the Petroleum Club. I believe that is 3636 East linden. Most of you probably know where that is.

One other item. To obtain a full copy of the draft EIR, it is on the City's web site at www.longbeach.gov. Either go to Public Works or to the airport's section. And it's available at the local library.

I would also like to mention, you see this comment box down here. In addition to giving testimony

today or your comments, the e-mail is of equal value. Giving your verbal comments or if you're more comfortable writing them out, they're of equal value, so please use whichever form or come on Monday evening. Monday evening it will be the exact same presentation as was given last Tuesday and today.

MS. BRADY: If I could just make one comment, especially given the crowd. If people would just prefer to give their comments one-on-one to the court reporter, they can do that.

MS. EBERHARD: If you're more comfortable not giving them in front of the group, you certainly can come up afterwards and give it individually to the court reporter.

Speaking of the court reporter, as I mentioned at the beginning of the meeting, it is helpful to have it be quiet so that she can get your comments exactly, and I would ask that you give -- as I think it says here for the City Council, give your name and address, and if you would spell your last name.

I think we have plenty of time. We've got almost -- well, now two and a half hours for comments. So I will ask for a five-minute limit, and we'll be pretty generous. I'm sure everybody will be able to live within that.

Your comments today, as Kathleen said, due to

the CEQA process, it requires that the City respond to all the comments in writing as part of the final draft EIR, and so answers will be given as part of that and not today. You can pose your questions, but they will be addressed in the final draft.

I think that covers everything. We've got plenty of time. So first speaker can come down, and we'll get started. Again, give your name, address and spell your name. Speakers?

And I will also mention that this ends the formal portion. Once you've given your comments, if you want to hear others, you're certainly welcome to stay, but feel free to leave and get on with your Saturday. Thank you very much for coming.

MR. JENSEN: My name is Terry Jensen. I live under the flight path, so I'm very well aware of the take-off and landing patterns of the airplanes, and I was just curious on when the noise envelope was shown on the maps, there is no differential made between the aircraft at take-off and landing from the east and take-off to the west or for the airplanes that take off -- that land from the west and take off on the east. The envelope only assumes the airplanes go in one direction.

It also doesn't include any envelope for the airplanes that take off on the short runway. It just

appears to me that the noise envelope is -- you're tilting the table a little bit too much to the side. I would like to see a little more objectivity in the evaluation of the noise.

Noise doesn't stop at the corner of a school, so I take great offense that it only takes a tiny portion of that school and that only a portion of Minnie Gant is affected by the noise.

Will they make any comments today?

MS. EBERHARD: Not today.

MR. JENSEN: Not today? Well, I'd like to see a little bit more. Thank you.

MS. EBERHARD: Could you give your address and spell your name?

MR. JENSEN: J-e-n-s-e-n, 4447 Country Club Lane.

I have a couple others --

MS. EBERHARD: Okay.

MR. JENSEN: -- while I'm here. I'm not shy.

In the parking, you show that you're going to have a parking facility that's going to handle 6200 parking -- 6200 cars on site. That's a net increase of over 3,000 cars on the site, but you show no traffic impact of having all the cars going to one location instead of cars going into two or three different locations.

So I think you should probably look at that a little bit better. At least I would consider that.

I'm also curious when was the contract let for the EIR?

MS. BRADY: February 2003.

MR. JENSEN: When was the site plan and elevation delivered to the contractee?

MS. BRADY: Just last summer, summer 2005. There was a delay because of the scoping. Had to do scoping twice.

MR. JENSEN: So when was the flight plan elevation, the one shown in this --

MS. BRADY: This last summer, 2005.

MR. JENSEN: Okay, so there was no site plan or elevation done prior to that?

MS. BRADY: No. Yeah, this is something we requested because we needed basic parameters for evaluating cultural resources and such.

MR. JENSEN: So this bears no relationship to the 97,000 square foot facility that was previously planned? No.

Okay, thank you.

MS. EBERHARD: Next.

MR. HAUBERT: Good morning. For the record, my name is Doug Haubert. Last name is spelled H-a-u-b-e-r-t. My

address is 2021 Snowden Avenue. And for the record also, my fellow airport advisory commissioners tell me that any time I publicly say anything, I'm required to state that these are my personal opinions and I am not conveying the opinion of the Airport Advisory Commission or any other members of the Board.

With that I want -- first, I'm going to reserve the majority of my comments, particularly the most significant ones, to the end of the comment period. I will probably submit some in writing to make sure there's a full evaluation of all the concerns that may need to be looked at.

The question I have right now in looking at Exhibit 7, which is the schools within the 60 CNEL. If it's possible to put that back up on the screen, I have a question, a clarifying question on that. If it's not possible -- and first, I want to compliment staff on putting together an excellent presentation.

Exhibit 7 I think is the one after that. Okay. It's the one that has a red box in the lower right-hand corner. It's right after the Minnie Gant picture, I believe. That's the one right thereafter.

In the bottom right-hand corner, there is a yellow arrow pointing to -- at least on the handout, it looks like the top of a red pentagon box, and it says

"Special Education Building."

My understanding is that the area within the red box is actually the Bixby Elementary School, which has an address on Stearns but backs up against Los Coyotes Diagonal. And the arrow is pointing to a part of the property off towards Los Coyotes Diagonal, and in particular it references a special ed building that I didn't know existed, but it doesn't reference Bixby Elementary School.

And I'm wondering -- first of all, the lines are very precise. It's interesting that someone on the north side of Stanbridge may be in the 60 CNEL, but if you're on the south side of Stanbridge, according to this, you may not be in the 60 CNEL.

So I guess if I did have a comment, it would just be the preciseness of this, which is probably not precision at all but really the best guess or the best -- a good faith attempt of staff to prepare as precise as possible a demarcation of where these noises are going to impact.

But the school over here, is that really a school, or is that part of the Bixby Elementary School, or is it an entirely different school? It's my clarifying question, if anybody knows.

MS. BRADY: There has been some contact with the

school district, and there's some question. We were told that it's actually just offices, but that when it was observed, it appeared as if students were going into it it.

So it would be the standard 65 CNEL, this is 60. But it would need to be coordinated, and that would be done as part of the plan that would be developed.

MR. HAUBERT: Is my understanding correct, that red box is actually the Bixby Elementary School? Is that not right?

MS. BRADY: I'm not sure which red box you're talking about. I'm sorry. I don't see the red box.

MR. HAUBERT: The actual hard copy is actually easier to see. Maybe I should provide you with my copy.

Here, go ahead. It is easier to see on the hard copy than on the diagram.

MR. MESTRE: The lower portion of the red box is the Bixby Elementary School.

MR. HAUBERT: And the playground area, that's the Bixby playground area, isn't it?

MR. MESTRE: I don't know that there's exclusive use of that playground to the Bixby Elementary School. It may be joined to the easement. I don't know the answer to that.

MR. HAUBERT: If the playground were in the 60 CNEL

and the building itself were not in the 60 CNEL, so the property were split, so to speak, would the Bixby School be considered within the 60 CNEL or outside of the CNEL?

MS. EBERHARD: And why don't you state it as your concern that can be addressed.

MR. HAUBERT: Sure. My concern -- I think I reference it as a comment also -- is that the precision of these lines really should not be considered, particularly by the decision makers that are here today, as precise as they are.

And I think an example that I think has been given over and over again is the concern about the noise at the Douglas Park project. Many, many people said that the people there will be impacted by the noise at the airport.

According to the map shown here today, Douglas Park is way out of the 65, way out of the 60, and according to the diagrams here, there will be absolutely no noise impact at all.

But I think common sense for people here, that that was major -- that was a major point in the decision making in the approval of the Douglas Park project is that those residents would be impacted negatively by the noise and might join with the neighbors that oppose expansion of the airport, but in this case, that area is well out of

the noise barrier.

And I bring that up because as planes land, they don't always land precisely in the same direction. I know because I used to live right in the flight path, and some of them come 65 feet to my left, some of them come 65 feet to the right. There's not a precise line. There's no real way to draw a precise line where all of the flights are going to come in on.

And these lines that show one side of the street being in the 60 CNEL, one side of the street being outside of the 60 CNEL, my comments are that these are at best rough estimates of where we expect the majority of the noise to come to, and that 60 and 65 CNEL is not what this body should be looking at or the decision makers should be looking at.

I am going to make the rest of my comments later. Thank you very much again for your time, and again I comment and absolutely say that staff did a good job. This is a good start. I don't think we're anywhere close to the environmental document, the end result here that we'll eventually have, but I want to compliment everybody on a very good start.

Thank you.

MR. BIXBY: Good morning. My name is Mark Bixby. I live at 501 Margo Avenue in Long Beach adjacent to the

Long Beach flight path. I apologize. Got a sore throat, so my voice is a little under the weather.

I am a member of the steering committee of the Long Beach Alliance, and I am here really as a citizen though to support the proposed airport improvements.

As the draft Environmental Impact Report concluded, the proposed project is the environmentally superior alternative. The 102,890 square foot terminal and the 14 aircraft parking pads are a reasonable compromise between what could be built were the City to follow FAA recommendations and history standards and the current undersized and inadequate temporary facilities.

The proposed terminal improvements will provide larger waiting rooms, more ticket and counter checking space, more concession space, cleaner and larger accessible bathrooms, modern baggage inspection handling equipment, more and closer parking space availability, and to sum it up, a much better image for the City of Long Beach.

As a member of the Long Beach Alliance, I have traveled around many of the districts in the city, made several presentations to better inform neighborhood groups about the terminal improvements. In those presentations, a vast majority of the feedback we received was supportive of the proposed -- I'm sorry. Did you not like --

MS. EBERHARD: Just go ahead. Let's hold our comments.

MR. BIXBY: A vast majority of the feedback we received was supportive of the proposed terminal improvement, the project.

The Alliance supports the existing noise ordinance and is on record opposing any increase in flights not allowed under the existing ordinance.

The EIR, through months of detailed study and research by independent professional consultants you've just heard from hired by the City of Long Beach, concluded that the airport improvements will improve the surrounding environment of the airport.

Let me restate and emphasize this point. The conclusion of the EIR as required under the California Environment Quality Act is that building nothing or building something smaller than what is currently proposed is worse for the environment than building the proposed terminal improvements.

People love the quick in-and-out experience of the Long Beach Airport. The proposed terminal improvements and enhancements will improve that experience. People love the classic feel of the original flight terminal building, and the proposed terminal enhancements will preserve the original terminal building

and classic feel, yet provide adequate space for passengers and airlines that serve them.

Building a smaller facility than proposed in the EIR or attempting to choke the airlines' ability to service the allowable flights under the current noise ordinance by eliminating a number of airline parking pads would be a dereliction of responsibility.

Our City staff and Councilmembers have heard from the vocal minority of residents who live in the flight path. Their concerns have been addressed through a variety of mitigation measures outlined today and in the proposed EIR, many of which would improve their current condition.

Now the City Council is charged with making the right decision for all of Long Beach and the region and for the three million plus airline passengers and thousands of airport area workers and employees.

It is time that the City of Long Beach replace the temporary trailers, the tented walkways, the chain link and barbed wire fence baggage handling facilities with permanent professional facilities.

These much needed and long overdue terminal and parking improvements will reduce jet idling, reduce airport service vehicle emissions, increase safety for passengers and for airport facility workers and enhance

the Long Beach travel experience and improve the image of the City of Long Beach.

Thank you for your time.

MS. EBERHARD: Thank you. Next speaker? Other speakers?

MR. GREEN: My name is Malcolm Green. I live at 1058 Palo Verde Avenue. I'm perhaps part of the vocal minority.

My concern is the noise problem. I moved into my area in 2000, and since the year 2000, I've gotten more and more noise over my head.

I have a couple of questions. My -- comment and questions. One of the questions is we talk about night hours without really specifying what they are. I assume that night hours were anything after 10:00 p.m. and before 7:00 a.m.

I understand that there is a lot of pressure to extend the hours of operation to 11:00 p.m., and I am strenously opposed to that. Currently, I'm awakened out of a sound sleep at 10:30, 11:00 o'clock, and sometimes even at 11:15. And fortunately, I have a clock right by my bed, and when I'm awakened, I know exactly what time it is.

And I understand there are exceptions for breaking the hours of operation. This is for things like

emergencies, military flights -- I have no problem with military flights -- weather delays, departure delays at other airports. But I also understand that there are penalties for these infractions, and I'd like to know what those penalties are.

I've heard that each airline, each carrier, has a noise budget and that by coming in after 10:00 o'clock or by exceeding the noise budget, noise for that aircraft during the normal operation hours, that carrier is penalized.

I'd like to know how effective these penalties are and what the deterrents are. I'd like those spelled out because I think unless those penalties are painful to the operators, the operators will continue to come in at 10:30, 11:00 o'clock at night.

I also noticed that the flights that are permitted include the cargo flights, Federal Express, Airborne and UPS. You don't have to be an aeronautical engineer to look at those flights as they come over as they're landing on runway 30 to realize those are very, very old air frames and with very, very old engines, and they are extremely noisy.

However, they only come over maybe once, twice, three times a day. I'm not at home all the time. I consider those to be the most nuisance producing carriers,

Fed Ex, Airborne and UPS.

I'd also like to comment on the issue of parking and drop-offs. I agree that if they provide additional parking, it will reduce the number of drop-offs. I am concerned, however, that the cost of the parking also determines the number of drop-offs.

Parking availability is only one of the factors. Increasing the cost of parking will increase the number of drop-offs. So I urge you to keep cost of parking reasonable so that I won't ask my neighbors to drop me off every time I want to take a flight in order to avoid 30, 60 dollars worth of parking fees.

And the other -- the last comment I want to make is -- this wasn't addressed, but also the impact financially. There was no talk -- this is obviously environmental impact, but I'd like a little more information about how this thing is going to be financed, what the passenger traffic is going to -- how that is going to be -- that is going to contribute to not having this cost taxpayers significant amount of money.

Thank you.

MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.

Next speaker? I know there were a couple more.

MR. BELL: My name is James Bell. Address is 2191 Ocana Avenue, O-c-a-n-a.

Very simple question, actually. Just something tying into the question that came from putting the slides up again. I was curious how the optimized flight scenario had an impact and grew the footprint, if you will, of noise to the -- on the landing side from the additional flights.

That makes logical sense to me, but it looked to me, at least looking at the images here on the screen, to have no impact to the takeoff side. Seems that more flights coming in one side should have the same amount on the other side.

So I'd just like clarification on how that was determined.

MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.

MS. ORTMAN: Good morning. Phyllis Ortman, 5302 East Green Meadow in Long Beach.

THE REPORTER: Spell "Ortman," please.

MS. ORTMAN: O-r-t-m-a-n.

I live in Lakewood Village section of Long Beach. I am sorry that the whole issue of the noise budget has to enter into whether we should have a new airport or not or modify the terminal.

We need a new terminal. That is a disgrace. And I use it as much as I can. I live right there. I also have occasion to bring groups of 40 people through

that airport from time to time. It's terrible to try and get 40 people through that airport.

My only question -- and I don't want to lose the historical perspective, and I appreciate the effort that's gone into that. My only question is is what's being proposed enough, and is it flexible enough so that if there are more passengers, they can be accommodated?

We need a modern airport, and -- or airport terminal. And I realize there are noise issues. The noise issues and the numbers of the planes that go in and out to me is a separate issue from whether we should modernize the terminal that we have. And I know I can speak for a lot of people in my neighborhood that would agree with this.

Thank you.

MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Hi. My name is Thomas Brown, B-r-o-w-n, and I live at 7049 El Paseo, and I'm also a travel agent. I work in Belmont Shore, and I live about a mile north of where the flights come through, and although I'm -- I can still hear them, but my concern is that as the airport expands -- I mean, if you build and expand an airport, you're going to have expanded number of passengers.

And so I'm just fearful that the surrounding neighborhood, even though you say the noise impacts -- I

mean, if you look at the noise impact diagram, most of the homes west of Clark are not impacted at all. But if you go there, it's obvious that they're impacted. I mean, it's hard to enjoy a quiet weekend, you know, with planes constantly flying over.

So, I mean, I would be in favor of a larger airport if it was not right dead center in the middle of Long Beach. And so that's my fear, that these surrounding -- Bixby Knolls, Cal Heights, Los Altos, where I am, they're just going to -- you know, into the future, they're going to deteriorate.

And even though it's nice for the big city downtown and the shore, it's not good for, you know, the middle of Long Beach.

That's all. Thank you.

MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.

MS. NADEAU: My name is Jane Nadeau, N-a-d-e-a-u. I live at 33 -- 3933 Lemon. I'm a resident of Bixby Knolls. I'm also a board member of Long Beach HUSH, and I'm also very active in my neighbor fighting graffiti and anything else that's disturbing wonderful quality of life.

I have several different questions, and some of them I will follow up with in written comment just 'cause I'll spell it out better when I reference the EIR at home.

On pollution, you talked about air quality, and

I brought it up the other night when I was at the first public hearing. I'm concerned about the amount of pollution that we're having, and I'm curious about all the sources that you all were using.

I mean, I know you're talking about AQMD and CARB, but some of the sources, like with the dirt and different particulates -- and I have no idea what all the little acronyms mean, so I won't even pretend like I do, but I'm just curious how much detail you all are going into on figuring out how it's going to affect folks.

I mean, children are a lot of people's concerns, and even though I don't have any, I'm really worried about it. I live right down the street from Hughes and Longfellow and Saint Barnabus. They weren't listed in the noise bucket thing, and I'm sorry, but I think they do get pollution from the airport. So I'm curious as to what the source is on that.

I also would like to know if jet fuel was included in the study on pollution because I know the terminal improvements are for the terminal, and a lot of people are bothered by the fact that some of us are worried about the noise and the air pollution.

When you build the improvements, it's going to look nice, and that's going to be a good thing. And I'm not opposed to improving the airport. I think it needs to

be done also.

But those of us that live with this every day are concerned about the overall effects, and not knowing -- I mean, yeah, you're going to get rid of some of the ground equipment by utilizing LNG or natural gas. Okay, that's nice, but we're still going to have the planes flying overhead, and I think we'd really like to know a little bit more about what that is and how you're going to mitigate it when we go to the extra 11 flights if the noise bucket gets reduced.

I'm also curious on the square footage size that you're talking about. In the map that you had at the very beginning where you have the yellow cross marks where Million Air is, is that included in the hundred and two proposed square footage?

MS. BRADY: The square footage is building square footage.

MS. NADEAU: Building square footage. So does that mean the canopies that you showed that are -- in the new design where the canopies are going to be on the outside, are those included, or is it just actual building?

MS. BRADY: My understanding is just actual building.

MS. NADEAU: So the canopy areas are going to be additional to the hundred and two, so to help make people

coming and in and out of the airport more comfortable?

MS. BRADY: The project description directed by the City council back in February did identify 102,000 plus of building, and then it did have other uses that were, like, a baggage claim such that were identified as just being outdoor but covered.

MS. NADEAU: Okay. So even though a hundred and two isn't what the AAC proposed and what other factions would like to see, we're still gonna get more than a hundred and two if it's determined that a hundred and two is the superior alternative plan because we are going to have additional outdoor spaces available and looking nice? I mean, it's all gonna blend in?

MS. BRADY: The additional outdoor spaces are consistent with the square footage directed by the City Council and Board.

MS. NADEAU: And then on the traffic concerns, I'm a little confused on how this is going to work, but -- so I'll probably spell this out in more detail in writing.

Most of the people that I know that use the airport like the drop-off factor because it's easy in, easy out, and the traffic report you all were talking about says that that's a bad thing for traffic. Which I can understand if you're going to increase the number of people flying in and out of the airport and everybody

drops them off, yes, that will increase it.

But the parking structure, I don't see how having a huge parking structure is going to encourage people to park their cars there for days. I mean, if they're only going out for the weekend -- like I said, most people I talk to drop off/drop in sort of thing.

So if when you do take the comments into consideration, the questions, if you could spell out a little bit better, maybe give some numbers on what you compared to. I know you said John Wayne in Orange and Ontario, but how was it determined that dropping off and -- is going to help reduce -- or is not going to be as effective as people parking in the parking structure for a couple hours or a day or so?

And like I said, I'll write that out because I know that didn't come out the way my notes were.

And I would like to just say as a member of HUSH and as a member of my neighborhood, we do recognize the airport needs to be improved. We're not opposed to that. And we're also aware that a lot of people were bothered that we keep bringing up the noise issue and the late night flights, but when you look at the big picture, that is the big picture.

You can build a nice terminal and you can improve the City's image, but if the residents are still

bothered and constantly have their quality of life disrupted by the noise and by the pollution, then that doesn't make the City of Long Beach a better place just because we have a nice terminal and we're still unhappy in our homes.

And personally, I'm seeing more houses going up for sale and more for rent signs, and we didn't used to see that. So I don't know what's contributing to it, but I just think you need to recognize that we're looking at the big picture, long term community, folks living here, and we just want to make sure the right thing is done.

Thank you.

MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.

Other speakers? Yes.

MR. McACHREN: Yes, good morning. My name is Kevin McAchren, and I know I'm going to have to spell that. M-c capital A-c-h-r-e-n. Wow, you're fast with that. 801 Pine Avenue, Long Beach, the downtown area.

I just wanted to come down this morning and state my support for the EIR findings. I would have probably preferred to have a little larger terminal space, but I think the 102,000 square foot plus space is a significant improvement over what we do have now, which is way too small.

I also wanted to stress the fact that the 14

parking positions -- and I think we've seen some references to gates or pads or parking positions. The parking positions for the aircraft I think need to be at that 14 level.

I personally have seen aircraft waiting on taxiways here at the airport at various times of the day running engines, running auxiliary power units because they don't have enough spots to park the airplanes, and I think this is certainly a factor in the air pollution is having the airplanes run for extended periods of time simply because they have no place to drop passengers off.

The noise issues I think were addressed quite adequately by the 1995 Noise Compatibility Ordinance, and that's a little over ten years old now, believe it or not, and it's the most protective ordinance as far as noise is concerned of any community in the United States.

We have the opportunity to have that ordinance grandfathered by the U.S. Congress even at a later date, and it's very important, I think, that that ordinance stand. I'm very much in favor of keeping the 41 flight and 25 commuter flight level with only additional flights as described under the ordinance, and I think that's a very important point.

I think a lot of people have a great deal of angst here over what is basically brick and mortar or

stone, steel and glass. It's a building. The building itself, the environmental impacts will be during the construction phase.

I don't see that the -- in fact, the EIR states that the larger project of nearly 103,000 square feet is more favorable because all of the other projects would still impact the environment during the construction period in a similar manner.

I think that what we're doing also is bringing all the parking back on the -- in the terminal area, so there will not be extra trips to remote parking. The community won't be impacted by that. All of the impacts of the parking will be within the perimeter of the terminal, the parking structure.

So it's a very good project. As I say, I think that a larger project probably would have been called for. I have seen studies that show there are about 15, 14 or 15 airports, I think, in the country that were compared to Long Beach that have very similar passenger loads each year, about four or five million passengers, which is what is projected for Long Beach in the future under the terms of the ordinance, and the square footages of those terminal facilities are largely twice to two and a half times as large as what's being proposed for Long Beach.

So let's get this thing moved forward. Let's

build it. As the EIR states, the project, I think, is much needed for Long Beach, and we need to go forward and not delay further.

Thank you.

MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.

Other speakers? Anyone else wishing to speak today? Okay. Last chance till Monday night, but you do have another opportunity.

With that, I'd like to thank you, and again, very much appreciate you taking time out of your Saturday to come down here, listen to the presentation and make your comments. And please tell friends and associates Monday night 6:00 to 9:00 p.m. at the Petroleum Club.

You certainly can come down and make personal comments -- not personal comments, but comments privately to the court reporter. Mary would be happy to take them. And with that, happy holidays.

(Whereupon the meeting concluded at 11:10 a.m.)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
) ss.
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES)

I, MARY E. PIERCE, CSR 6143 and Deposition Officer for the State of California, certify:

That I attended the foregoing hearing and that all argument and comments made at the time of the proceedings were recorded stenographically by me and that the foregoing is a true record of the proceedings and all comments made at the time thereof.

I hereby certify that I am not interested in the event of the action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have subscribed my name this 3rd day of January, 2006.

Certified Shorthand Reporter in and
for the State of California

73